

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18-22, 30, 31, 33, 38-45 have been amended. Claims 5-7, 26-28, and 46-47 have been canceled. Claims 48-54 have been added. After entry of these amendments, claims 1-4, 8-25, 29-45, and 48-54 will be pending.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS

The Examiner informally objected to claims 5-7 and 26-28 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Applicants respond that no multiple dependent claims have been presented in this application or any of the office action responses. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have canceled claims 5-7 and 26-28 and rewritten them as claims 48-53, such that the claims from which they depend are presented prior to their being listed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 22, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The Examiner stated that the limitations “potentially about” and “likely about” rendered the claims indefinite because the specification and the claims did not explain what these terms mean. Applicants respectfully disagree; however, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims.

The dependent claims 2-21, 23-42 and 44-54 incorporate the limitations of their respective amended base claims. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 should be withdrawn in light of the amendments discussed above for all of the claims.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 20, 22-24, 26-27, 41, 43, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoth et al. (US Patent No. 7,099,887). In an informal discussion on May 31, 2007, the Examiner informed Applicants that the Hoth reference should have been cited as Meyer et al. (US Patent No. 7,178,099 B2). As such, Applicants will only discuss the Meyer reference in response to the 102(e) rejections, as the Hoth reference has not been applied to the rejected claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method comprising:

- identifying an entity name from an event associated with an article;
- identifying contact information from multiple events, the contact information related to the entity name;
- associating the contact information from multiple events with the entity name;
- determining a probability that the contact information is correctly associated with the entity name;** and
- storing the entity name, the probability that the contact information is correctly associated, and at least some of the contact information.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate some of the limitations previously found in claims 12 and 17. The claimed method, as amended, identifies an entity name from an event associated with an article and identifies contact information from multiple events, the contact information related to the entity name. It associates the contact information from multiple events with the entity name and determines a probability that the contact information is correctly associated. It stores the entity name, the probability, and at least some of the contact information. Independent claims 22 and 43 recite similar features.

Meyer generally discusses meta-content analysis and annotation of electronic documents. (Abstract). Meyer also discusses creating a meta-content index according to a plurality of types. (Col. 2, lines 21-22). Meyer does not disclose, however, “determining a probability that the contact information is correctly associated with an entity.”

Meyer simply does not make a probability determination as to whether the contact information is correctly associated. The Examiner refers to column 10, lines 39-67 and column 11, lines 3-35 in discussing the application of the Meyer reference. These passages generally discuss the extraction of dates and entity types from email messages, not any probability determination of whether the contact information is correctly associated with an entity. Meyer also discusses the normalization of dates and currency to standardized representations and the application of rules to dates to determine a missing year. However, none of these passages mention, hint at or suggest a probability determination of whether contact information is correctly associated with an entity.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 4-21, 25-42, and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer in view of Burke (US Publication No. 2004/0133561). Applicants respectfully submit these claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants further submit that Burke does not cure the deficiencies of Meyer. It similarly fails to disclose “determining a probability that the contact information is correctly associated with an entity.”

Burke discusses a method and system for identifying alternate contact information. (Abstract) By using a known contact point, Burke attempts to identify alternate contact

points. (Abstract) However, Burke never mentions determining a probability as to whether the contact information is correctly associated with an entity. Rather, it only deals with “known” contact points that help to find alternate contact points. As such, Burke does not disclose the limitation of “determining a probability that the contact information is correctly associated with an entity.”

The Examiner cited to paragraph 131 of Burke as disclosing the limitations of claim 17. At best, paragraph 131 discusses a de-duplication process, whereby “any duplicate PII retrieved in the query process is preferably discarded from the result set.” In other words, if “multiple records in the Database yield the same result to a query”, for example five instances of the identical email address, “only one instance of that result should be returned in the results.” No probability determination is discussed whatsoever. Rather, Burke merely discusses a de-duplication process, such that if multiple, identical email addresses are retrieved, only one of the identical addresses will appear in a result set. As such, the limitation of “determining a probability that the contact information is correctly associated with an entity” is simply not disclosed by Burke.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 22, and 43 are allowable over the cited reference for the reasons described above. Claims 2-21, 44, 46, 48-50 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and claims 23-42, 45, 47, 51-53 depend directly or indirectly from claim 22. Claim 54 depends from claim 43. In addition to containing all of the limitations from the claims from which they depend, respectively, these claims also contain additional limitations that are not shown by Meyer nor Burke.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID BENJAMIN AUERBACH, ET AL.

Date: July 27, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com